

San Diego Harbor and Mission Bay, Calif.

Columbia River, from Vancouver, Wash., to The Dalles, Oreg.

(Monday and Tuesday, May 6 and 7, 1946)

Big Sandy River, Tug and Levisa Forks, Va., W. Va., and Ky.

(Wednesday and Thursday, May 8 and 9, 1946)

Arkansas River, Ark. and Okla.

COMMITTEE ON INVALID PENSIONS

There will be a public hearing before the Committee on Invalid Pensions at 10:30 a. m. on Tuesday, May 7, 1946, in the committee hearing room, 247 Old House Office Building, on H. R. 3908, entitled "A bill to provide increased pensions to members of the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who become disabled by reason of their service therein during other than a period of war," which was introduced by Representative LESINSKI, of Michigan.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1251. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Secretary of War transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the creation of an American Battle Monuments Commission to erect suitable memorials commemorating the services of the American soldier in Europe, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1923, as amended, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BULWINKLE: Committee on Printing. Senate Concurrent Resolution 60. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce to have printed for its use additional copies of hearings held before said committee on S. 1253, Seventy-ninth Congress, relative to modification of railroad financial structures; without amendment (Rept. No. 1978). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate 7. An act to improve the administration of justice by prescribing fair administrative procedure; with amendment (Rept. No. 1980). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BOYKIN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 611. Resolution granting 6 months' salary and \$250 funeral expenses to Jessie E. Jones, wife of B. F. Jones, late an employee of the House; without amendment (Rept. No. 1979). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BIEMILLER:

H. R. 6297. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to change the age for old-age and survivor benefits from 65 to 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H. R. 6298. A bill to protect and facilitate the use of national forest lands in T. 2 N., R. 18 W. Ohio River Survey, township of Elizabeth, county of Lawrence, State of Ohio, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 6299. A bill relating to the exemption from claims of creditors of United States savings bonds of series E; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 6300. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to lend Navy Department equipment for use at the Twenty-eighth Annual National Convention of the American Legion; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MASON:

H. R. 6301. A bill to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 6302. A bill to authorize the payment of compensation for time lost in the case of certain veteran and nonveteran employees of the United States restored to active duty after disapproval of charges against them; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. FLANNAGAN:

H. R. 6303. A bill to amend the provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act relating to marketing agreements and orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 6304. A bill to authorize the furnishing of motor equipment to seriously disabled veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 6305. A bill to make permanent the provisions of the act of July 11, 1941, prohibiting prostitution in the vicinity of military and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROE of New York:

H. R. 6306. A bill amending section 1, act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662; 10 U. S. C. 1423a); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRANAHAHAN:

H. Res. 610. Resolution favoring a temporary peace agreement with Italy; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRETT of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 6307. A bill for the relief of Francesco D'Emilio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BEALL:

H. R. 6308. A bill for the relief of John F. Guthridge; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois:

H. R. 6309. A bill for the relief of Rudolf Alt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. DOUGLAS of California:

H. R. 6310. A bill for the relief of Hsi Tseng Tsiang; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 6311. A bill for the relief of Mitsuo Arita; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6312. A bill for the relief of Yukiko Kimura; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 6313. A bill for the relief of the estate of Yoshito Ota; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6314. A bill for the relief of Dementina Camara, Mary Kapola Kaleikini, and

John Kaleikini, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARY:

H. R. 6315. A bill to continue in full force and effect patent No. 1,990,645; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6316. A bill for the relief of Nandor Frieder; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 6317. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to appoint Henry A. Veillette a second lieutenant in the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PATRICK:

H. R. 6318. A bill for the relief of the Alabama Flake Graphite Co., a corporation; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PATTERSON:

H. R. 6319. A bill for the relief of Flora Palmer; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6320. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Fenno W. Newman; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6321. A bill for the relief of Dr. Theodore A. Geissman; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1859. By Mrs. DOUGLAS of Illinois: Petition signed by 1,285 operating and nonoperating railroad employees, offering an amendment to House bill 1737 for a 30-year pension or 60 years of age at \$150 a month, two-thirds for the widow, providing she is 55 years of age and does not remarry, the petition supporting the Cosgrove plan and protesting pension amendments (S. 293 and H. R. 1362); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1860. By Mr. GAVIN: Petition of Mrs. L. E. Chapman, Warren, Pa., and also other residents of Tidoute, Warren County, Pa., protesting against enactment of Senate bill 1606 and House bill 4730; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1861. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Dr. N. E. Hunt, Charles Huff, N. B. Jordan, Joe B. McNeely, Rev. Harley Ritter, James M. Corley, Emanuel M. Castellanos, Leslie E. Wood, P. J. Waddell, Haven Tackett, Sam P. Owen, Everett Bishop, L. A. Varnes, James E. Bratcher, Ralph A. Jackson, Thomas G. Beckham, and Daniel Speegle, from Waxahachie, Tex., favoring House bills 5689 and 5746; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

SENATE

SATURDAY, MAY 4, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Spirit, closer to us than we are to ourselves, in this quiet moment make our hearts and minds sensitive to Thy presence. We who through another week have urged on all our mental and physical powers with strain and stress would now grow still and responsive before the highest we know. Refresh our faith that the tensions of life may not

break our spirits. Remind us that beyond the appraisals of man there falls upon our lives the searching light of Thy judgments. Widen our sympathies, expand our understanding, override our prejudice until the whole earth be our fatherland and starving, stricken humanity under all skies our care. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, May 3, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 60, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act, approved March 1, 1907, the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of parts 1 and 2 of the hearings held before the said committee during the Seventy-ninth Congress on S. 1253, a bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes, relative to modification of railroad financial structures.

REPORTS OF FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARD AND FOREIGN-TRADE ZONE NO. 1

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McMAHON in the chair) laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Commerce, Chairman of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, and the annual report of the city of New York covering operations of Foreign-Trade Zone No. 1 during the calendar year 1944, which, with the accompanying reports, was referred to the Committee on Finance.

PETITION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Boston, Mass., favoring the continuation of the Office of Price Administration, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

S. 763. A bill to provide for the leasing of allotted lands on the Crow Indian Reservation; with amendments (Rept. No. 1302);

S. 1681. A bill to provide for adjustments in connection with the Crow irrigation project, Crow Indian Reservation, Mont.; with amendments (Rept. No. 1300); and

S. 2077. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of June 4, 1920 (41 Stat. 751), entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands of the Crow Tribe, for the distribution of tribal funds, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of May 26, 1926 (44 Stat. 658); without amendment (Rept. No. 1301).

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Rules:

S. Res. 260. Resolution creating a special committee to consider certain matters relating to the reorganization of the legislative branch of the Government; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1299).

PERSONS EMPLOYED BY COMMITTEES WHO ARE NOT FULL-TIME SENATE OR COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a report for the month of

Name of individual	Address	Name and address of department or organization by whom paid	Annual rate of compensation
Mrs. Alma B. Kidwell.....	113 Park Blvd. SE.....	Federal Communications Commission.	\$1,500

B. W. WHEELER, Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARVILLE:

S. 2147. A bill for the relief of Howard A. Yeager; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 2148. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in Fallon County, Mont., to John J. Reiger; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2149. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Victoria Bird;

S. 2150. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Thomas A. Pickett; and

S. 2151. A bill authorizing the conveyance of certain lands in the State of Montana to James O. Garden; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MITCHELL:

S. 2152. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to pay salary and expenses of the chairman, secretary, and interpreter of the Yakima Tribal Council and other committees appointed by said Yakima Tribal Council, and official delegates of the Yakima Tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 6056) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1947, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

THE TRIAL OF MARSHAL MIHAILOVICH IN YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, at the end of every war there is always an overflow of passions which war and strife engender. We have all noted that one of the areas in which this factionalism or internal division of opinion seems to exist and flourish is Yugoslavia, a war-torn country where there were two military leaders, one Marshal Tito and the other Marshal Mihailovich. I do not know anything about the reasons behind this cleavage, nor do I want to interfere in the affairs of Yugoslavia, but I have

April 1946 from the chairman of a certain committee, in response to Senate Resolution 319 (78th Cong.); relative to persons employed by committees who are not full-time employees of the Senate or any committee thereof, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMITTEE

MAY 1, 1946.

To the Senate:

The above-mentioned committee hereby submits the following report showing the name of a person employed by the committee who is not a full-time employee of the Senate or of the committee for the month of April 1946, in compliance with the terms of Senate Resolution 319, agreed to August 23, 1944:

read in the press recently that Marshal Mihailovich is to be tried as a war criminal. Without knowing the facts, I have read this with some regret, because it has come to my attention that he has been instrumental in aiding many American aviators who were shot down over Yugoslavia and neighboring countries to escape capture and to return to their own commands, after which the same aviators rendered very valiant service in overcoming the Axis Powers.

One of the young aviators who was shot down comes from a very representative Maryland family, and his brother had a similar experience to that which he himself shared in the stirring days of combat. He has written me a letter which I shall take the liberty of reading, in the hope that war passions may subside sufficiently to enable the services rendered to be appraised on the scales of justice as evenly as it is possible to weigh them, without malice or factional or partisan advantage or consideration.

The letter is dated Eccleston, Baltimore County, Md., April 9, 1946, and reads as follows:

HON. MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: During the war, I was a fighter pilot and had the misfortune to have to leave my plane returning from a mission to Ploesti. I spent a month and a half in Yugoslavia in 1944, among Mihailovich's Chetniks before returning to Italy, and have nothing but thanks to offer for the care I received and nothing but praise for the way a badly oppressed people were bearing up under the buffets of both sides.

Whether Mihailovich's ideas on the unification of Serbia and the methods he used to accomplish this were right or wrong, the fact remains that for every British and American foray, for every bridge destroyed, for every German troop and supply train blown up, the price was paid by the indiscriminate slaughter of the first 20 people the Germans encountered the next day in Belgrade. These people who were paying with their lives for the privilege of having British paratroops harass the Germans in their own backyards were Mihailovich's people, nor was Tito ever

bothered by such scruples being simply the leader of anyone who wanted to fight.

At the time I was in Yugoslavia there were 14 separate groups of confused guerilla soldiers. Mihailovich is an intelligent, sensitive man who worked his way up to a position of respect in his own country, and his hope was to bring Serbia through this conflict as a unified country instead of a squabbling mass of 20 or 30 dissenting groups, as there are today. In no sense of the word could he be considered a war criminal, subject to the same punishment as, for example, Goering and his ilk, nor was he a traitor, having told the British and the world exactly what he was trying to do.

Whatever the merits of the controversy between Mihailovich and Tito may be, and whatever may be the decision of the Government which one ought to be recognized, it seems a pity that a brave man and a representative of a very large group of people should be sacrificed in a quarrel that is local.

On behalf of myself and all American airmen like me, and because I think it is only just, I hope that this Government will use its influence to prevent this man being sacrificed simply because for the moment his rival leader has the ascendancy.

Very truly yours,

HOWARD BAETJER II.

Mr. President, the letter speaks for itself. I know nothing about the internal conflict and clash of ideologies and loyalties in Yugoslavia, but I do know that Mr. Baetjer is a very well-balanced, well-informed and well-seasoned young man in the affairs of this world. I know that he had a gallant war record. I know that he had escaped from Yugoslavia largely through the aid of Mihailovich, and I sincerely hope that the good offices of our Government, within proper limitations, will be used and our influence exerted at least to see that one who has helped so many of our captured airmen to return to their commands during the war will not be unfairly dealt with in this hour of strife and passion, which is an overflow from the closing hours of the great conflict we call World War No. 2.

I am happy to present this as one of several letters along the same line from gallant men who had attempted to free Yugoslavia from the yoke of the oppressor and who were helped by Marshal Mihailovich to achieve their freedom, when, without his help, they would have been captured by the Axis Powers.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. LUCAS obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McMahon in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Cordon	Hill
Austin	Donnell	Hoey
Ball	Downey	Johnson, Colo.
Bankhead	Eastland	Johnston, S. C.
Barkley	Ellender	Langer
Brewster	Ferguson	Lucas
Briggs	Fulbright	McFarland
Brooks	Gerry	McMahon
Bushfield	Green	Magnuson
Butler	Gurney	Maybank
Byrd	Hart	Mead
Capehart	Hatch	Millikin
Capper	Hayden	Mitchell
Carville	Hickenlooper	Moore

Murray	Russell	Tydings
O'Daniel	Saltonstall	Walsh
O'Mahoney	Shipstead	Wherry
Pepper	Stewart	Wiley
Reed	Taft	Willis
Revercomb	Taylor	Wilson
Robertson	Tunnell	Young

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOSSETT], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HUFFMAN], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MYERS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are detained on public business.

The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] is absent on official business, attending the Par's meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent on official business attending the Paris meeting of the Council of Foreign Ministers as an adviser to the Secretary of State.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANFILL] are absent by leave of the Senate.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BUCK], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate convenes on Monday, and thereafter during the further consideration of the pending joint

resolution, no Senator shall speak more than once nor longer than 1 hour on the joint resolution or any amendment thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I object.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield further?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that, beginning with the session of the Senate on Tuesday next, and thereafter during the further consideration of the pending legislation, no Senator shall speak longer than 1 hour on the joint resolution or any amendment thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wish to say that at this time it is hard to tell what debate will be required to discuss the amendments to the pending joint resolution. I doubt very much whether any Senator will want to speak more than an hour after Tuesday. On Monday, personally I want to speak more than an hour, but on Tuesday I am very doubtful that any Senator will need to speak more than an hour. But one never can tell.

Mr. BARKLEY. I will say to the Senator that the proposal I have made for an hour on the joint resolution or any amendment thereto would give each Senator 2 hours.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. It would seem to me that would be entirely reasonable, and I doubt whether any Senator would use the full 2 hours. But without such a gag rule I think we can pretty well depend on no extended speeches being made on amendments. So far as I am concerned personally, I shall object to the unanimous-consent request at this time; but if there are delaying tactics, or if a filibuster develops, I will join the Senator from Kentucky in attempting to meet that situation and I will do everything I can to expedite action on the joint resolution.

Mr. President, this is an important measure. Perhaps no measure which has come before the Congress in recent years has been of greater importance. I object to a gag rule being imposed on the Senate at this time.

The Senator from Kentucky pointed out that the attendance of Senators has not been very flattering during the past week. That is true, and it is extremely unfortunate. In my opinion, the word has gone out to the proponents of the measure not to interrupt opposition speakers, to ask no questions, to make no replies to arguments that are made. As a matter of fact, the only Senator who has challenged statements here on the floor is the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], and he has done a very fine job. He has brought out some points that have been extremely helpful and constructive in this debate. But, aside from the Senator from Arkansas, there has been very little challenging of arguments made against the loan, and in my opinion—and it is my private opinion—the debate as carried on by the proponents of the joint resolution has been

a disgrace to the Nation and to the Senate. The proponents have not made a case. They have not stated their position. They have not answered arguments.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] asked for some important data. It has not been furnished. The senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] issued a strong challenge, which has never been accepted. Other Senators have done the same thing. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] and many other Senators have asked for information and have challenged the proponents of the measure to furnish them information, but it has not been forthcoming. They did not reply. In my experience in the Senate I have never seen a time when so many Senators have not reached a final decision on a measure as is the case at the present moment in connection with the pending joint resolution. The debate has extended over a considerable length of time, and still there is indecision in the Senate. It would appear to me to require not only further debate, but more constructive debate. I cannot see the wisdom at this juncture of attempting any sort of gag rule.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to comment briefly on one phase of the Senator's remarks. He stated that the debate on the joint resolution, so far as the proponents are concerned, has been a disgrace to the Senate and to the United States. That is a rather harsh description of an honest effort which has been made from the very beginning. During the preliminary discussion of the joint resolution 3 weeks ago I spent a couple of hours trying honestly to answer questions propounded to me. I have sent out no word to any proponent of this measure not to ask questions of Senators opposing it. I myself have asked a great many questions. The other day the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and I spent most of the afternoon inquiring of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] with respect to the arguments which he was making against the joint resolution. I do not believe that any opponent of the joint resolution has a right to complain that while he is speaking Senators do not interrupt him and thereby make him speak longer than he intended to speak. Certainly no Senator who opposes this legislation has any legitimate right to complain if other Senators do not interrupt him or ask him questions.

The Senator from Colorado refers to this request as a gag rule. We all know that we cannot obtain a limitation of debate without unanimous consent, except by a two-thirds vote of the Senate under what we call cloture. My request is more reasonable and more generous, it seems to me, than the average request made for limitation of debate. One hour on the joint resolution and 1 hour on any amendment would give any Senator 2 hours if he desired to occupy that length of time.

I realize that the Senator from Colorado does not agree, but it seems to me

that after 3 weeks of debate—whether it has been largely taken up by the proponents or the opponents is of no consequence—the request for limitation of debate to 1 hour on the joint resolution or on any amendment, which is really, in effect, a limitation of 2 hours, is not an unreasonable request for the limitation of debate on a matter which I concede is as important as any legislation we have had, or probably will have before the United States Senate.

Am I to understand that the Senator from Colorado objects to my last request?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I object to the request that the debate be limited on next Tuesday. I repeat that I am sure the debate will not exceed 2 hours on the part of any Senator. I feel certain of it. As I understand, the first amendment to be considered is the amendment of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND]. I should be greatly surprised if debate on that amendment lasted more than 3 or 4 hours. Probably the debate on no other amendment to the joint resolution will last more than a few hours. But it is difficult to predict. We cannot tell what kind of stormy weather we may run into in connection with amendments, or what information we might require in order to resolve them. I do not believe that we should tie our hands at this time. Therefore, I feel that the request of the Senator from Kentucky ought not to be granted.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I make this further request: I ask unanimous consent that at an hour not later than 5 o'clock p. m. on next Thursday the Senate proceed to vote on the joint resolution and all amendments thereto to final passage.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, personally I feel that probably we shall reach the moment for final decision at least by Thursday. However, I do not believe that we need to do it by tying our hands. I think we will do it in the normal course of events. I therefore object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, America is the land of plenty and the land of opportunity. America has more material wealth, a better standard of living, and higher wages than any nation in all the history of time. Business, labor, and agriculture have never experienced such sustained prosperity as they have had during the past few years. Yet, with all her wealth, with the manpower and ability to make even greater industrial progress, and with the vast knowledge recently accumulated to guide her in the future, America is now confronted with problems of such major portent as to threaten her economic stability. It may take a depression to bring us to our senses.

If we should be so unfortunate as to be plunged into an economic dilemma which takes us through an inflationary boom and another destructive depression, the cause can be laid on the doorstep of greed and selfishness. These two horsemen of destruction are riding high.

They continue to leave in their wake strife, misery, and turmoil.

Hardly had the last gun been fired in the Japanese war when the reign of selfishness began. It has never ceased. The great victories we have won in battle at a staggering cost in human blood and treasure are almost forgotten in the mad scramble of dog-eat-dog and the devil take the hindmost. It is a sad commentary—a severe indictment of a nation to which the world looks for leadership and stability in the arduous days ahead. We seem to be utterly blind to conditions in the rest of the world. We fail to give the proper attention and respect to the fact that we are the most fortunate of all God's children.

We all should be grateful for the heritage of plenty. We should be humble in the progress we have made. We should extend more than the yardstick of tolerance to one another because there is plenty in America for everyone.

Mr. President, America is at the crossroads. As Bernard Baruch recently said, "The whole world is watching us, amazed at the exhibition of the giant who cannot pull himself together even to take care of his own needs." We have seen labor and management battle for months for prestige and power. We have witnessed one strike after another—all of which have seriously curtailed and impeded our program of reconversion back to a normal peacetime economy. We have seen Government intervention in an earnest and courageous attempt to lend a helping hand in the titanic struggle between these economic powers.

Let me say that all the obstinacy and selfishness in this case has not been on one side, but what a great many people have forgotten in this row between labor and management is that the public interest is involved. No one can deny that the public interest has suffered an irreparable loss in the last 6 or 8 months. What the public has suffered in previous strikes is a mere bagatelle as compared with what it may suffer if the bituminous-coal strike is not settled at once. All America should awaken to these plain and unmistakable facts and the dire consequences which will follow if there is a failure to produce coal.

I shall use my own State of Illinois as a typical example of a situation produced by this strike—a situation which will become intolerable unless men responsible for these conditions take to heart the meaning of domestic tranquility and the general-welfare clause of the Constitution of the United States.

This morning's newspaper carries, under a Chicago date line, the following:

[From the New York Times of May 4, 1946]
CHICAGO DIM-OUT THREATENS TO MAKE THOUSANDS JOBLESS—CITY AND ITS SUBURBS ENTER ON AN EMERGENCY CURTAILMENT TO A 4-HOUR DAY—THEATERS CLOSE DOWN AT 6 P. M.

CHICAGO, May 3.—Reduced hours of employment and in some cases total idleness for thousands of wage earners loomed today as Chicago and its suburbs went on a virtual 4-hour work and entertainment day schedule as the emergency electric power curtailment tightened.

The unprecedented dim-out, which was extended today to central Illinois, was or-

dered by the Illinois Commerce Commission to save dwindling coal supplies resulting from the strike of John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers Union, AFL, and the Independent Progressive Mine Workers Union.

In Indiana the State public service commission yesterday authorized the Northern Indiana Public Service Co. to ration its power in 22 up-State counties, tentative plans for a "brown-out" of the rest of the State were being laid tonight.

Illustrating the seriousness of the situation in this city, which is overlapped by the vast industrial belt of northern Indiana, was the preparation by manufacturing plants, most of which worked only 4 hours today, of operating schedules for next week which would put thousands of employees out of work or on substantially reduced hours not to exceed 3 days a week.

Employers, most of whom maintained 4-hour operating schedules today, estimated that because of the Illinois Commerce Commission's order production will be cut from 40 percent for those working a 5-day, 40-hour week up to 60 percent for those operating 6 days a week on three shifts.

The Chicago Association of Commerce estimated tonight that the city will suffer a minimum production loss of \$10,000,000 a week from the power order, although the figure probably will be much higher.

After 2 days of conferences Republic Steel Corporation tonight began closing down its south Chicago plant, which will remain closed as long as the power order is in effect, said C. P. Cutler, district manager. About 3,500 employees will be thrown out of work. Its coke oven and blast furnaces will remain in operation, however.

In compliance with the dim-out, more severe even than in wartime, Chicago's Big Loop stores, affiliated with the State Street Council, and other groups, announced that starting tomorrow they would remain open only between 2 and 6 p. m. Outlying stores voted likewise.

In similar manner all Chicago movies shut down at 6 o'clock today, and will open only between 2 and 6 p. m. weekdays and will close Sundays.

Legitimate theaters likewise were to close nights, except for the Shubert chain of six Chicago theaters, whose manager, Sam Gerson, asserted he would defy the night ban.

Whatever the cost of the power curtailment, it is a necessary step, declared William Parrillo and Frank Peska, members of the Illinois Commerce Commission. They repeated the warnings publicly made by the Commonwealth Edison Co. and associated utilities responsible for the generating and supplying of vital electric power, that, unless coal is mined and distributed by May 14, coal stocks now available will be exhausted, and electric power will be virtually ended by May 21.

Collection and distribution of rail freight have been thrown into turmoil by the dim-out order. William Crawford, general counsel for the Cartage Exchange of Chicago, Inc., said. He said irregular hours maintained by various stores, warehouses, and other businesses as a result of the power curtailment have hindered pick-ups and deliveries of freight.

He said truckers may appeal to the commerce commission to set a uniform schedule to eliminate these delays, and added that the trucking industry is considering operating only on the first 3 days of each week during the emergency.

Only one major concession was made, with consent of the Commonwealth Edison Co., the commission authorized minimum sufficient elevator service in office buildings between 9 a. m. and 6 p. m. However, electric power for lighting and other purposes is banned except between 2 p. m. and 6 p. m. The modification of the order does not con-

template use of all elevators in any building at any one time—only the fewest number that can handle passenger loads. More than 150 office buildings will benefit.

Some of the day's conferences were with spokesmen of the State Street Council and the Chicago Retail Merchants' Association. Stores affiliated with these groups began reducing current consumption the moment the emergency dim-out was ordered, but said it might be necessary to continue other normal operations until Tuesday.

Chicagoans adjusted themselves a little better today to the emergency conditions. Greatest confusion occurred in buildings with elevator service. The original order stipulated normal elevator and lighting service between 2 and 6 p. m., with use of limited elevator service, such as on Sundays, outside these hours.

We have in Illinois a dim-out which is more serious and more restrictive than anything which was imposed in time of war. But it is absolutely necessary in view of the short supply of coal in the stock piles of the public utilities which furnish power and light.

Telegrams and letters are reaching my office in large volume from individual citizens and those operating the industries in my State, all of whom are filled with alarm and bitterness.

Mr. President, I refer the Senate and call its attention to the large group of telegrams which I now have on my desk. I have not had an opportunity even to read all of them. They come from people in my State who communicate with me with respect to the coal strike, and all have come in the last 3 days. They represent only a part of the communications which are coming from the people of Illinois who are tremendously disturbed about what is going to happen to the economic conditions in that State. I undertake to say that what happens there will happen in similar fashion throughout the entire Nation.

Mr. President, as a result of the coal shortage, industrial and commercial paralysis threatens my entire State; and what is true in Illinois is obviously true in every other industrial section of the Nation.

The last action of the Office of Defense Transportation in issuing emergency orders cutting rail-freight shipments to bare necessities and reducing passenger service to 50 percent below that of April 1 speaks volumes as to the seriousness of this crisis.

The latest survey of railway fuel stocks as of April 29 shows an average of 27.3 days' supply. On that date the railroads were using approximately 260,000 tons or 5,000 cars daily, but this rate of consumption has been considerably reduced during the past few days as a result of emergency conservation measures now effective on all railroads.

Any statement of average stocks, however, does not properly reflect the seriousness of the present railroad fuel situation. Several railroads, large and small, are confronted with a real emergency, and the necessity of drastic curtailment of fuel usage as well as the furnishing of every possible measure of assistance to these roads is plainly indicated. For example, as of May 2 we have the following situation on those railroads

now reported dangerously low on coal stocks:

Supply:	Railroads
Below 10 days.....	2 large, 3 small
10 to 14 days.....	9 large, 3 small
15 to 19 days.....	8 large, 2 small

Everyone knows that the railroads have been and will continue taking vigorous and necessary action to help themselves. For example, one large eastern railroad has made heavy curtailment on Sunday freight service, reduced local freight service to a triweekly basis, and effected a substantial reduction in switching schedules. Through these conservation measures this railroad has reduced coal consumption since April 25 by approximately 30 percent.

One large railroad operating out of Chicago with only 16 days of coal on hand has made heavy curtailment in freight and passenger service and is now considering still further action in this respect. As a result of these economies, coal consumption of this line has been reduced 15 percent as compared with the first part of April. In Chicago they are also studying suburban passenger service and will doubtless have to reduce commuter trains within the next few days.

Another large midwestern line has been forced to limit all passenger service between Chicago and St. Louis. Within the past few days two railroads, one operating in the East and one in the South, have had to call on the Association of American Railroads to request emergency fuel allotments from the Solid Fuels Administration in order that they might continue operations over the week end.

Mr. President, these are only a few of the highlights, and the tragedy grows by the hour.

These facts and figures should alarm every American, even John L. Lewis, if he is anxious to see his country secure and strong. But apparently, Mr. President, John L. Lewis ignores and flouts these dangerous facts. He has no concern for our national necessity. He treats with utter contempt the urgent pleas of the President of the United States and his representatives. He is running true to form. His haughty disregard for his Government and the people, in the strategic position he now occupies, is a serious threat to our democratic way of life. But, Mr. President, no man in America is bigger than his Government. The democratic processes, even though they be slow and painful, shall continue to operate, John L. Lewis to the contrary notwithstanding.

It may be said in passing that there are 600,000 bituminous coal workers now on strike. No one was disturbed about that during the first 2 or 3 weeks, because the miners during the war had done a magnificent job and had earned a well-deserved vacation. But the tactics of John L. Lewis are serving no good purpose for the miners in the controversy before the Nation. The miners are fine people. Many of them are my friends. We know that they are engaged in dangerous and hazardous work. We know that further reforms are needed in order

to protect them from sickness and accident. We know also that other reforms should be brought about, and I am willing to give to the miners the proper help at the proper time. But it cannot be done through methods employed by Lewis at the expense of the remaining 137,000,000 Americans. The greatest disservice of all times is now being done to the miners through the arbitrary and dictatorial methods of their leaders.

Mr. President, I submit that the time has passed when these conditions can continue. Confusion reigns in my State and throughout the Nation. It will be added to tenfold within another 10 days or 2 weeks, unless those who are responsible for this strike come to their senses and realize what an economic impasse means to the future of this Nation.

Mr. President, what the Congress of the United States can do in the short space of time that is allotted is extremely questionable. I presume we would take as much time in this crisis in debating labor legislation as we have in debating the British loan. In the meantime our commercial and transportation activities would be completely paralyzed. The health and sanitation of the Nation would be impaired, and chaos would reign. I do know that time is running out. We cannot toy and play with this crisis any longer. Unless John L. Lewis bows to reason, the President of the United States must seize the mines under his wartime power and request the men to return to their jobs. The people and the Government will vigorously applaud and support such a move.

Mr. President, I am certain there are many men in the rank and file of the miners' organization who do not agree with John L. Lewis in his present exorbitant demands. It is almost unbelievable that any one man in this Nation would take the position Mr. Lewis has taken in his negotiations with the operators. For weeks he met with them, discussed literature, quoted from the Bible, and stomped out in his aged, blustering, prima donna fashion. During all that time he knew, and the country knew, that the coal supply was growing smaller and smaller. He knew, and knows now, that the future stability of America depends upon an adequate solution of this coal strike. This strike presents the unusual. It is different from previous strikes. In those strikes collective bargaining was employed for the purpose of obtaining better wages. In this strike the wage question has not been discussed unless it has been taken up within the last 48 hours. The operators are willing and ready to meet a reasonable and fair increase. But, instead of bargaining for increased wages, John L. Lewis, monarch of the mines, has presented a royalty plan asking for 10 cents a ton, which would net him annually between fifty and sixty million dollars for the purpose of establishing a health and benefit fund for the miners. No one will disagree with the humanitarian purposes for which the proposal allegedly is made, but certainly there will be plenty who will disagree to turning fifty to sixty millions of dollars, with no strings attached, over to John L. Lewis, autocrat of the union.

Mr. President, under this set of facts no economic strike is involved. These facts utterly failed to come within the opinion of the Supreme Court, which declared economic strikes justifiable and necessary. I assert, under these facts, that this is not an economic strike. This is one of those new breeds of strikes which are beginning to harass the United States, and which have no legal or moral justification.

Mr. President, if Lewis can call a strike of his miners under those conditions, and, for example, he does not like me or the President of the United States, he can call a strike of his miners under any other conditions. I assert that that principle is wrong legally and morally, and that it should not prevail. The truth of the matter is that this is a political strike, waged by John L. Lewis for the purpose of obtaining more power. This is the kind of a strike which seriously challenges the fundamental concepts of free government. It is revolutionary in character and scope. It is the kind of a strike which has been used to destroy governments in other nations. It is somewhat similar in character to the strike which John L. Lewis called in the winter of 1945 when he had a separate quarrel with the employers and with the Government over his attempt to organize supervisors. At that time, as now, the question of wages as between the employer and employee was not involved.

Mr. President, we have come a long way in the last 50 years. Our industrial strength was never greater. Large communities are so utterly dependent upon the maintenance of essential services that constitutional guaranties of liberty become practically meaningless if the Government does not protect citizens from being deprived of life, liberty, or property by use of organized private force. I assert with all the emphasis at my command that no minority group should ever be entrenched with a power which can be used to strangle the industrial and commercial life of this Nation.

When I think of what could happen to the public health and safety of this Nation if this strike should continue for another 30 days, I am compelled to assert that a political strike of this character could easily become an insurrection against the Government, and that if this Government has not the power under the Constitution to outlaw strikes of this character it has no power of self-preservation.

Mr. President, the free institutions of America are involved in this question. Every American citizen should awaken to the danger that lies ahead. I respectfully submit that this is the paramount issue before the country today. Every Member of Congress should seriously and immediately consider the question of what legislation could be prepared to aid in this extraordinary emergency.

In conclusion, I should like to say that this last performance of John L. Lewis has dealt a heavy blow to the cause of labor. It must be remembered that there is always a legalistic line of demarcation which can be drawn in this Republic when favored groups abuse the

privileges which they enjoy. Industry has had a similar experience. It was only a short while ago that industry ruled supreme. It took suffering and bloodshed and a sympathetic Government to break a power which was too often abused. John L. Lewis was one of the leaders who helped labor gain its rightful place in the economic sun. But having reached the top, and drunk with power, he becomes enamored with his own greatness. He follows in the footsteps of those economic royalists whom he helped tumble from the throne in the years gone by.

STATE DEPARTMENT POLICY AND MERCENARY TROOPS

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I rise to call the attention of the Senate to developments now in progress within our State Department which I take to be of the gravest concern to the American people. You may recall, Mr. President, that at the beginning of this year Raymond Daniell, the correspondent of the New York Times, disclosed that the American Army had clothed and armed two bodies of troops in the American zone, one calling itself the Royal Yugoslavian Army, and the other consisting of a part of those Polish troops who have not returned to their homeland. Mr. Daniell at that time raised the question whether these troops were not in effect a mercenary group, and reported that some observers said these troops were to be used as a nucleus of a foreign legion constituted by us for then undeclared purposes. You may also recall, Mr. President, that after these reports were confirmed by Mr. Homer Bigart, of the New York Herald Tribune, and other correspondents, the Secretary of State himself, Mr. Byrnes, issued a statement saying that orders had been given to the American commanders in the zone to cease any and all actions which supported these London Polish and Royal Yugoslav troops.

The whole situation caused alarm to men everywhere who concern themselves with the winning of the peace in Europe and in the world. Mr. Byrnes' action quited the fears, and were accepted in good faith. But now in the last few days three things have happened which not only raise up the old alarm but also threaten to change the whole structure of the relations of this Government with the rest of the world.

I refer first to the appearance of Secretary Byrnes before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee just prior to his departure for Paris. It was an executive session. Some of us perhaps learned for the first time what went on when we read Mr. Drew Pearson's column Wednesday morning of this week, May 1. Among other matters Mr. Pearson reports:

Senator VANDENBERG then pressed for an answer as to how the State Department feels about disposition of the Polish armies of General Anders, which fought in Italy with the Allied forces and now don't want to go back to Soviet-dominated Poland. Again Byrnes dodged an answer, saying it was up to Congress to determine whether these Polish troops might be granted American citizenship as members of our armed forces,

or might be taken into the American Army as a sort of foreign legion.

What amazes me about this report is the assumption which lies behind Mr. Byrnes' suggestion, that we are in the habit of granting American citizenship, as members of our armed forces, to troops who are citizens of another government with whom we have full and recognized relations. What also amazes me, if this report be true, is the baldness of Mr. Byrnes' further suggestion that these troops might be taken into the American Army as a sort of foreign legion.

But let me at this moment continue with the rest of Mr. Pearson's story. He goes on:

Byrnes made it plain that the Russians have indicated definite hostility toward American acceptance of these anti-Warsaw Poles.

Then adds this note:

NOTE.—Byrnes did not indicate that the State Department is studying the question of what to do with the exiled Poles. However, members of the Military Affairs Committee have been discussing with the War Department the idea of using these Polish soldiers to cut our own draft calls. This idea was proposed some months ago by James Cromwell, former United States Minister to Canada, and the War Department has asked the State Department's advice regarding what the repercussions would be from Russia.

I said there were three things which have happened in the last 10 days which give me pause. The second confirms this note of Mr. Pearson's, that the State Department is studying the question of what to do with these so-called exiled Poles. It is reported to me that on Thursday, April 25, the State Department dispatched notes to the other governments of the Western Hemisphere to inquire whether those governments would be willing to take portions of these Polish troops, I judge, in proportion to the respective countries' size and, I assume, in company with ourselves.

If I had heard that the British Foreign Office had sent such notes, if I had heard that members of the House of Commons had suggested that British citizenship might be one answer to the difficulties the British Government is having in demobilizing Gen. Wladislaw Anders Second Polish Army Corps in Italy, if I had heard that the British Cabinet had considered the formation of a foreign legion from among these Polish forces who, in the air, on the sea, and on the land have for so many years been financed by the British Government, I would not stand in such amazement. I know there are strong elements in Britain, the chief spokesman of which is Winston Churchill, who would conceivably like to see such steps taken. At the same time I know, as you do, Mr. President, that the British Government has been following a much wiser policy and has been in direct consultation with the Polish Government itself in Warsaw as to the return of these troops to their rightful home, and that the Polish Government has declared itself ready to receive them back to work in the restoration of their nation.

If it were not for the third incident which I shall shortly bring to the atten-

tion of the Senate, I would be content to believe that Mr. Byrnes' words before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the notes dispatched by the Department of State were merely steps taken in coordination with all our allies and not a part of a deliberate policy to create and support mercenary elements for potential war use. I would then assume that we had been in touch with the Polish Government itself. I would assume that the matter might properly have been on the agenda of either the Foreign Ministers' meeting in Paris or of the Security Council of the United Nations.

But what are the facts? Not only is there no evidence that the Polish Government has been consulted in these schemes to distribute its citizens round the world and to constitute them as foreign legions, but there is this third astounding fact: At this moment the commander in chief of all these landless Polish forces is flying the Atlantic Ocean to land in this country on an American visa. He is General Bor-Komorowski, the man who is blamed by the Polish Government for the destruction of Warsaw; the man who, when four German armored divisions were moving on Warsaw from the west, gave the signal for an uprising which left the city in ruins and its citizens dead. He was head of the so-called home army, the military arm of the discredited Polish exile government in London. He has since been made, in an attempt to exploit the notoriety he gained for his part in the Warsaw uprising, the head of all the exiled Polish forces.

It may be said: "Well, let him come; let him make his speech in Chicago Sunday on Polish Constitution Day. Let Mayor Kelly welcome him. Let him go about, to Detroit, to Buffalo, to New York, to all centers where Polish Americans are concentrated. And let him go back to London and look after his troops."

But wait. Here is where what Mr. Daniell reported in January, what Mr. Byrnes had to say to the Senators, and the notes of the Department of State all come together in what appears to me to be a conspiracy fraught with danger for all of us. For General Bor-Komorowski is the head of that Army and brings with him the whole conspiracy of the old London Polish regime and this newest development of it, the creation of a foreign legion out of these landless Polish forces.

I want the Senate to have a clearer picture of this Bor-Komorowski. I want my colleagues to know, first of all, that the British Government has refused to deal with him in any discussions of the Polish troops. I want them also to know how he came to his present position. He is an old-line cavalry officer useful to stronger men behind him. I have been informed that outstanding among them all is one man, the man who made Bor-Komorowski, a man who in the years before 1939 was close to the Colonel's Group of Beck and the others who betrayed Poland. This man was then head of Polish G-2, the secret service. He is now the moving hand behind Anders, Bor-Komorowski, and the whole mis-

chievous use to which the 100,000 odd Polish troops left stranded in Europe by the war's end are being put. He is General Pelczynski, and it is he with whom we will have to deal if we permit Bor-Komorowski to settle down in our midst.

This, then, is the pass it appears to me the policies of Mr. Byrnes and our Department of State have got us into. We will have as our guest from Sunday on the head of an army without a country, floating loose like a mine in the international sea. Our Department of State appears to be contemplating transporting this man's troops to the Western Hemisphere. I will say, Mr. President, as a footnote here, that we have enough Fascists in the Western Hemisphere, in our own country, without importing any mercenary Fascists from abroad. Our Department of State has proposed to the governing committee of this body on foreign affairs that we might give these troops American citizenship or constitute them into some sort of "foreign legion."

Such a legion would be something new in the political and military life of the United States, and I for one think the American people ought to know about it. It is an act in direct contradiction to our tradition. In fact, it was with the use of such mercenary troops, the Hessians, that the British tried to defeat this people in their War of Independence. At that time the American Army was proud to have in its ranks such distinguished foreign officers as von Steuben, Lafayette, and Kosciuszko, men who led American troops, members of an American Army that has never had any mercenary tradition, never any foreign soldiers serving under American command for money.

In the past we have seen many nations fall that tried to base their military power, not in a national army, but in one recruited among foreigners. In Rome, it led to the downfall of the empire, in Byzantium, and in Turkey. In each case, the consequence was the creation of an armed force independent of the nation, and capable of fighting not so much for the nation as against it.

What James Cromwell suggested and what, if Mr. Pearson's report is correct, is now a contemplated policy of the War Department to cut our own draft calls, the idea of using these Polish troops, is the first step in a direction which spells doom for us as a people.

And do not think that I exaggerate. With the conditions in Europe today there is no shortage of candidates for such a legion. After the Poles we shall have the royal Yugoslavs. We shall have all the Russians and Ukrainians from the puppet Wlasow Army, the Russian Quisling who fought on the German side against the United Nations. And shall we not have the Germans and Italians, the dissident elements, the cadres of discontent, always waiting for such an opportunity? We could see gathering in under the American uniform an army constituted of people who fought against us in the past and who will readily, if the objective is "right," fight for us in a foreign nation. Fight for us? For

whom? For the American people? Have the American people been asked? Have they said they want to hire mercenaries? Have any of us heard of this, except Mr. Byrnes?

I propose, therefore, to ask:

First, that the visit of this Bor-Komorowski be fully explained by the Department of State, his whole itinerary published, and the date of his return to England be immediately determined and publicly announced;

Second, that the Department of State make public any and all negotiations which have been carried on with any Western Hemisphere nations in regard to the disposal of Polish troops; and

Third, that the Foreign Relations Committee report to this body the full text of Mr. Byrnes' remarks concerning the use contemplated of these troops, and ask for the information of the Senate, a full report of the Department of State on this whole question.

THE COAL STRIKE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I wish to emphasize what has been said by my colleague the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas] concerning the desperate situation that is now presenting itself in Illinois. The State having been put on a 24-hour basis for power by virtue of the shortage of coal affecting our utilities, hundreds of thousands of our laboring men are reduced to half time. Among the messages which have been pouring in to me the last 2 days are many from veterans who have returned from their service overseas asking if that is what they fought for.

Because of the danger of fire hazard and utility shortage, I called the Secretary of War yesterday to see if the War Department would cooperate with the Sanitary District of Chicago in giving what permission they can for an increased flow of water from Lake Michigan, to add to the power that is being created at the power plant at Lockport, in order to protect the water supply of Chicago and provide adequate fire and sanitary protection. I am happy to report that he immediately called the Chief of Engineers, and they said they would give us all support possible.

Mr. President, if this strike continues longer, what has happened in Illinois will happen in every other State, and then perhaps we will realize that it is now the responsibility of the administration of the United States to protect the people of this country.

Great powers—greater powers than were ever given to an Executive in the history of our Nation—were given to the President of the United States during the war, and he still has all those powers, and has a right to use them to protect the people. I say that it is the responsibility now of the President of the United States to utilize the powers which have been placed in his hands by the representatives of the people, and if they are not sufficient, then it is the responsibility of the administration which controls Congress to initiate legislation promptly, without delay, to afford whatever remedy we may find to be necessary in the event of a failure of the administration to act.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not know of an individual who lives in or out of this country who is an uglier menace or a greater threat to our form of government than John L. Lewis. As the absolute monarch, the despot, and tyrant of the Nation's coal miners who produce the life blood of industry, this Mussolini of the mines stands in position to paralyze the commerce and virtually all activities of the greatest Nation on earth. I do not deny that some of the reforms he advocates for the benefit of the miners are entirely worthy, but the methods employed by him in attaining his goal are inimical to, and not in accord with, our form of government. He is the unashamed exponent of the most dictatorial and totalitarian methods that could be imposed on a free people. He is sly and cunning, this Lewis, and he is most cautious in timing his demands. As in the ruinous coal strike now in progress, he has selected a period when our country is vitally in need of fuel for its frantic attempt and effort toward reconversion and sustained production of goods that are so greatly needed by our people.

When I first came to the Senate, in 1937, my initial speech was in criticism of the plans and methods employed by this obnoxious bully in his attempt to force his will on industry. In March 1937, when the sit-down strike method of coercion was in full sway, Lewis made brazen attempts to force management to do his bidding. I said on March 19, 1937, respecting the so-called sit-down strikes:

This new method of attack on the part of some labor leaders in their desire to force employers to meet their demands is a force which if continued to be exercised will be destructive of our Government.

I said further:

The sit-down strike method is abhorrent to me, is un-American, is nothing short of a hold-up, and should no longer be tolerated * * *

I sympathize with these strikers, but I am against the methods employed by their leaders. I cannot believe that the strikers are responsible for the method now in vogue. I blame their leaders.

I quote further from my remarks made in 1937:

I do not know who is responsible for this. I am told that John L. Lewis is the leader of the movement. If Mr. Lewis is, I brand him as a traitor to American ideals and a menace to the peace and prosperity of our Nation.

Today, Mr. President, with all the emphasis and force at my command, I repeat the charge made by me in 1937, unqualifiedly, in the light of subsequent events. He is the same Lewis.

It will be recalled that in October 1941, at the height of this Nation's defense effort and only 5 weeks before Pearl Harbor, all industry was crippled and was seriously threatened with a complete shut-down by a general coal strike impudently called by this traitor Lewis. On October 29, 1941, in the course of my remarks in the Senate, I recalled to the Senate the statements I made in 1937, excerpts from which I have just read, and I said further in the remarks made by me in 1941, and I quote:

At the time I made the charge against Mr. Lewis—

That is, at the time I made the charge in 1937—

I was in doubt because I did not have positive knowledge of who the traitor was. In the impending labor trouble we know that the leader is Mr. Lewis—

That is, in the strike that was called in 1941—

he has come to the surface in his usual arrogant and defiant manner. I now take occasion to renew affirmatively my charges against Mr. Lewis, not only branding him a traitor to our American ideals and a menace to the peace and prosperity of our Nation but a traitor to the boys who are now preparing themselves to defend our Nation and preserve our cherished liberty.

I repeat the charge, Mr. President, and add that he is doing violence to the principles for which so many of the young men of our country gave their lives to preserve.

I quote further from my speech of October 1941:

I further brand John L. Lewis as a menace to the labor movement in this country.

Permit me to say in passing, Mr. President, that it was a great pity that this agitator, this arrogant dictator, was taken into the folds of the great labor organization known as the American Federation of Labor. I predict that the membership of this fine organization will soon disown him and regret that he was ever permitted to again sit in their councils. Further quoting:

The present administration has leaned backward in its efforts to help the workingman. * * * I now desire to warn labor * * * not to follow this labor agitator, this labor bully, who seeks advancement not through the usual orderly and democratic methods heretofore adhered to, and in normal times, but who seeks to accomplish his purpose at a time and with full knowledge that noncompliance with his demands will threaten our very existence.

Again quoting from the same speech:

I plead with the laboring man to foster a movement to oust such leadership before it is too late. Do not force Congress * * * to pass laws that will take away from labor some of its most cherished rights. The patience of Congress and of the American people is almost at an end.

Mr. President, on this occasion I wish to reiterate in toto the sentiments expressed by me in 1941. There is no doubt in my mind that if the laboring people of this Nation retain such a rascal as Lewis as their leader the Congress will be compelled to pass legislation that may be most hurtful to labor. I, for one, do not care to take drastic steps against labor, but I can see no other course for many of us who have been friends of labor to take.

Mr. President, what will be the effect of this coal strike to the coal miners and to the people as a whole? As pointed out by the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Lucas], who spoke a few minutes ago, it is crippling to our whole industrial, agricultural, and commercial fabric. The coal miners are not able to withstand a long strike. They are losing heavily. It is costing them about \$5,000,000 a day in the loss of wages alone. It is costing them in excess of \$100,000,000 a month. The "holiday" in April has cost them that amount. They

are bound to suffer more as time goes on, because the longer the strike lasts the more scarce will commodities become, and with that the cost of living will rise and black marketing will thrive.

What about the idleness that is bound to follow in the steel industry? Unless coal is made available, all of us know that that industry will have to close down, and every manufacturer who requires steel will likewise be compelled to shut down his plant.

What about transportation, which is now so necessary? The farmers in many parts of our country are now in need of transportation to carry and distribute perishable foods in various parts of the country. What about electric power, which is now so essential? What about lighting in the streets, in the stores, and in the homes? What about the power necessary to keep refrigerating plants of all kinds in operation in order to preserve food? Why, Mr. President, there is no telling the extent to which this strike may affect the lives of our people.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I do not rise to praise Mr. Lewis or to try to protect him. But I ask this question: What law is Mr. Lewis violating at the moment? What is he doing that leaders of all other labor organizations have not been doing during the past year or the past many years?

Mr. ELLENDER. If Mr. Lewis were violating any law at the moment, I would be the first one to swear out an affidavit against him that would lead to his arrest. Unfortunately he has been able to get by. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to vote today for any law which will prevent a leader of his character undertaking to obtain relief under such an un-American way, as I will attempt to point out in a moment. It is true that other labor leaders have sought to improve the lot of the laboring man, but the most of them have resorted to the usual and customary manner of reaching their goal.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does not the Senator think that possibly a little bit of the responsibility lies with the Congress in not writing a labor law that is fair to both the employers as well as the employees?

Mr. ELLENDER. That may be, and I may say further there can be no question about that. We cannot, of course, anticipate what the future holds after a law is enacted by Congress. In many instances laws are not administered so as to carry out the will of Congress. I may state further that the responsibility lies not only with the Congress but with the administration itself. Both Congress and the administration have been leaning backward in order to assist labor. Of that there can be no doubt. I am very hopeful that in the near future the Congress will enact laws which will prevent the development of such a crisis as we now face. The Senator from Indiana was not a Member of the Senate at the time the so-called Smith-Connally Act

was passed, some time in 1941, as I recall, or early 1942, the purpose of which was an attempt to curb the actions of such men as John L. Lewis. There is no question in my mind that what prompted Congress to enact the Smith-Connally Act was the activities of John L. Lewis in 1941 in respect to the coal strike I mentioned a while ago and—

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CAPEHART. Is it not a fact that the administration for some 14 years has encouraged such movements, and had laws passed which made it possible during the past 6 to 12 months for such conditions to exist as do exist today in respect to strikes?

Mr. ELLENDER. No; I would not say that. There are always two sides to almost any question. I do not intend to go into any details in respect to the circumstances surrounding the passage of labor legislation in the past 10 or 12 years. But I would say that industry itself was as much to blame, if not more so, than was labor for the enactment of the labor laws to which the distinguished Senator has expressed dissatisfaction. If industry had come to Congress with clean hands back in 1933, when the Wagner Act was considered by the Congress, I am satisfied that a less drastic law would have been passed. But no. What did industry do? Industry kept in the background fighting to the extent of its ability to the enactment of any labor laws. It assumed a negative attitude, notwithstanding existing evils. Industrialists thought they could defeat the passage of the Wagner Act; and if they failed in that, they assumed they could influence the Supreme Court of the United States to declare it unconstitutional. I think I am fully justified in saying that industry did all it could to defeat the act when it was under consideration by Congress, and then tried to have it declared unconstitutional. It strikes me very forcibly that, if management had taken part and itself had come before Congress at that time with clean hands and had tried to cooperate, the Wagner Act would not have been passed in its present form. With all of the so-called one-sided phases of the Wagner Act, I think that most of the trouble was brought about by the manner and method in which some of its provisions were interpreted and administered.

Mr. CAPEHART. Does not the Senator feel that the time has come, in the name of labor, industry, the farmer, and all Americans, to enact laws which are fair and equitable to all—just as fair to labor as they are to industry—so that this question can be settled once and for all, before our Nation is ruined?

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the Senator that I am privileged to be a member of the Committee on Education and Labor. In the consideration of recent legislation I have taken the position that some positive steps should be taken. If and when the bill now on the calendar known as the Case bill comes before the Senate for consideration, I expect to vote for some of its provisions—in a modified form; not all of them by any means. I expect to support at least two proposals

which I intend to discuss in my remarks—one in regard to supervisory employees and the other respecting secondary boycotts. As for the remaining provisions, I expect to oppose them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. John L. Lewis needs no defense at my hands, and I am sure he is not asking for it. He does not expect it. He does not ask anyone to defend him. He can take care of himself in any arena anywhere.

I do not agree with my friend from Louisiana in his appraisal of John L. Lewis. I have known John L. Lewis for a great many years, and I have witnessed the great fight which he has made for the coal miner—not only for a better standard of living for the coal miner but for safety measures for the coal miner. We know that in spite of the good work he has done and the faithful service he has rendered to the workers in coal mines every few months disastrous accidents occur in some of the great coal mines of the country. In almost every instance the disaster can be laid to negligence on the part of persons who should have looked after the safety measures.

The slaughter of coal miners in this country is a terrible thing. While John L. Lewis is the target at the moment, nevertheless, the cause which he serves so faithfully and so well should not be overlooked. In our antagonism to John L. Lewis we can vent our feelings against him, and he will not mind it. But we should not lose sight of the problem to which the efforts of John L. Lewis have been directed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not unmindful of the problems confronting the coal miners. There is a most hazardous occupation. What I am complaining about are the methods resorted to by Lewis to correct allegedly existing evils. I hope that the distinguished Senator from Colorado does not think that the sit-down strike was a valid method which should have been resorted to by Mr. Lewis in attempting to coerce industry to do his bidding.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; I do not defend the sit-down strike.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, the Senator does not defend it. It is a product of totalitarianism and yet Lewis advocated that method in this country to attain his goal. If John L. Lewis could have had his way he would have coerced industrialists to do his bidding by having the workers sit down in their plants and saying, "Unless you do as we demand, you cannot come into your plants and operate them. We shall retain possession until you meet our demands." I am simply trying to show that the methods employed by Lewis are un-American and are of the type used by Hitler and Mussolini in the height of their power. As I shall demonstrate in a few moments, the demands now being made by Lewis upon the coal operators do not involve the question of wages or hours or security, but the proposition of obtaining tribute through the imposition of some form of excise taxes. He is attempting to exercise the functions of the sovereign.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As I see it, it is a demand on the part of John L. Lewis that the welfare and safety of the coal miners be protected. As to the tribute which is supposed to be exacted, that is another thing. I am not discussing the methods at all. What I am discussing is the objective. I say that the objective of John L. Lewis to safeguard the miners is worthy of any man's great effort.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not inclined to disagree with the distinguished Senator from Colorado as to the objectives. However, from the information that I have at hand I am inclined to believe that he has grossly exaggerated the case. I shall read the views from an official of the Bureau of Mines in a moment to show the progress that has been made in recent years to safeguard the lives and the health of miners. What I am finding fault with is the undemocratic methods used by this dictator to attain those objectives. I repeat the methods are un-American and are foreign to the precepts of a democratic form of government as I shall try to show in the course of my remarks.

Before I was interrupted—and I do not mind interruptions—I was trying to show what a continuation of this strike will mean. Coal is necessary for the production of steel. Steel is essential for the manufacture of almost every commodity from a locomotive to a hairpin, from an automobile to an ice box. In fact, today it is really the main ingredient in industry. Without it the wheels of industry are bound to cease functioning.

Coal is necessary for the preservation of food. In this country there have been developed new methods of preserving food. Instead of canning, one of the methods employed is quick freezing, which is extensively used. If this strike is permitted to continue it may mean the loss in great refrigerating plants of vast quantities of food which is so necessary to our people at the present time.

Mr. President, our reconversion plans will be almost stalemated. Our returning soldiers, who are now trying to obtain employment or continue in such employment as they are now engaged in, will be denied that opportunity. Few of them have reserves to maintain themselves. If this strike lasts from 30 to 40 days longer, there is no telling what hardships every citizen of the American Republic will suffer.

What, Mr. President, is the cause of this strike? Speaking for myself, I would at no time vote for any measure designed to deny labor the right to strike. I think it is a sacred right of the workman which must be preserved. We have today on the statute books the so-called Wagner Act, which was referred to by the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] a moment ago. In that act methods are set out for negotiating and finally entering into contracts between labor and employers. There is the well-known method of collective bargaining, under which labor sits on one side of the table and industry

on the other, and both discuss various methods of settling controversies and the terms of future agreements. It is a method that has been long recognized as the best way for labor and management to come to a mutual understanding governing their working relationship. Has that method been resorted to in this case? I am told it has not.

Mr. President, what is at issue? Is it wages? That cannot be, because I am informed that that phase of the controversy has not been discussed at all by Mr. Lewis. He has simply shunned it, although the strike is now almost 5 weeks old.

Let us see what the miners were receiving as wage earners just before the war, back in 1941. At that time the basic pay was 85 cents an hour. The average hourly wage, including overtime, was 88½ cents. It will be recalled that the Little Steel formula was instituted some time in 1941, and the month of January 1941 was established as the period at which there existed fair relationship between what workers were then receiving and what the cost of living was. When the Little Steel formula was promulgated a 15-percent allowance was to be permitted in order to level off, in the case of some wage earners, any differences which might exist between the cost of living and their wages. At that time, which was soon after that method was resorted to, the base pay of the coal miners was immediately increased from 85 cents an hour to \$1 an hour, and the hourly earnings averaged \$1.07 with overtime considered.

By January 1946, because of overtime and fringe adjustments, although the basic was maintained at \$1 an hour, the hourly rate had increased to \$1.26. That came about by allowing the miners to work somewhat longer hours and by paying them for the time required to go from their homes to the place where they worked, that is, down in the mines. Before that time such payment was not made. I believe that change was one of the victories, if it is to be called that, which John L. Lewis obtained in the contract with the mine owners in his controversy back in 1941, which I discussed a while ago.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. CAPEHART. I am certain that the Senator from Louisiana will not object to having me correct one statement which he made, because I know he desires to be fair. I think the arrangement which was entered into was that pay was to be allowed, not for the time the miner took to go to the mine from his home, but for the time it took him to go from the mouth of the mine to his place of work in the mine.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sorry. I understand that most mine workers live on the property of the mine owner.

Mr. CAPEHART. Of course, if they live within 100 yards of the mouth of the mine, the time they take to go to their place of work in the mine will be included as a part of their hours of

work, except for the time it takes them to travel the 100 yards from their homes to the mouth of the mine.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, prior to that time the mine workers were not paid for the time it took them to reach their places of work. Their pay was received only for the time they were actually at work, and not for the time it took them to go from the entrance of the mine to the places where they worked. That change has meant, as I understand, that the miners now receive pay which they did not receive in prior years. I recall now that it is called portal-to-portal pay.

Mr. President, as I have indicated, by January 1946, the hourly wages of the mine workers had increased to \$1.26. That meant that from 1941 the wage increased 42.6 percent. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics the cost of living rose only 33 percent. So it can readily be seen that the miners did receive a fair increase in their wages.

In a few moments I shall show that they are the highest paid workers in America.

Now I revert to the wage adjustment which was made in April 1941, to fit the pattern of the Little Steel formula. It meant an increase of 13.2 percent. In February 1943, when the 6-day week was established, the increase in take-home pay made it possible for them to receive more money than that received by any other class of workers in industry.

Mr. President, I wish to quote from the data furnished by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which for some reason or other differs just a little from the figures I have just quoted. The figures I have quoted come from the report made by the coal producers themselves, and they show that in January 1941, the hourly pay received by the miners was 88.5 cents, and in December 1945 the average was \$1.28 an hour—or an increase of 44 percent, whereas the cost of living, as I have just indicated, had increased 33 percent.

In 1941 the take-home pay was \$26 a week, and by early 1946 it had increased to \$54 a week.

Mr. President, let me contrast the wages which have been paid to the coal miners with those received by workers in various other industries.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Do the statistics represent an annual wage, a weekly wage, a daily wage, or an hourly wage?

Mr. ELLENDER. They show the average weekly earnings of all workers in various industries, and I am about to state them.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. But the figures the Senator from Louisiana has already given are not on an annual basis. Of course, the Senator knows that in many sections of the United States coal mining is a seasonal occupation, and that the miners are compelled to take long lay-offs. I wondered whether the statistics the Senator submitted took that fact into consideration.

Mr. ELLENDER. The figures were prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I simply inquire whether they are prepared on an annual basis or a weekly basis.

Mr. ELLENDER. That should make no difference, because for the period taken the miners were well occupied. I presume they are in the same category as other industrial workers. As the Senator knows, the coal miners are fairly well occupied the year round—at least, they were for the past several years—and the same is true as to the workers in the industries to which I shall refer.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The figures the Senator has presented are for the war years, I assume.

Mr. ELLENDER. I obtained the most recent figures. They are as of December 1945. They are the last statistics which I have been able to obtain.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think they will be very valuable, but I think it should be remembered by everyone that a coal miner has to live 12 months of the year, even though he works only a part of the year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why is it that he cannot work the whole year round? Can the Senator tell us that?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Because the occupation is seasonal. Sometimes they have to take long lay-offs.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Because during a part of the year there is decreased demand for coal, and sometimes the mines do not want to store coal. The result is that in many coal fields the coal miners lay off more than they work.

Mr. ELLENDER. I hold in my hand a statement by Mr. Charles O'Neill, who is spokesman for the operators in the negotiations which now are going on between the coal operators and Mr. Lewis. I quote from his statement:

The miners are the highest paid workers in any large labor-employing basic industry. The average daily earnings are \$11.50 for every person employed at the mines. Reports to the United States Treasury for withholding taxes show actual average earnings in 1945 to be \$2,885. Adjusting this for 18-percent absenteeism shows an average potential wage of \$3,500 per year. Some mine workers actually made over \$7,000 in this same year.

Reverting now to the wages or weekly earnings of labor in other industries; as I have indicated, bituminous-coal miners receive average weekly earnings of \$58.20; anthracite miners, \$54.73; metalliferous metals, which include copper, magnesium, and other metals, \$44.78; crude petroleum, \$52.93; electric light and power, \$49.78; all manufacturing, \$41.43; durable goods, \$44.33; nondurable goods, \$38.67.

So the issue in the pending strike is not one of wages. I will endeavor to point out in a few minutes further reasons why I think wages are not at issue.

Mr. President, can the issue be one of hours worked? No; because the hours worked per week have been reduced to 36. For all hours more than 36 per week the miners receive compensation at the rate

of time and a half. Today a miner may work 56 hours a week, but for every hour he works more than 36 hours, he receives compensation at the rate of time and a half.

As I have indicated, Mr. O'Neal has pointed out that the average pay of miners, year in and year out, is \$2,885. Some miners receive as much as \$7,000 a year, or pay amounting to almost \$600 per month.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the figure which has just been given by the Senator from Louisiana contemplate overtime pay, or only 36 hours a week?

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, no; it represents take-home pay.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. For 56 hours.

Mr. ELLENDER. No. Although the miners may work 56 hours, the record shows that their average number of hours worked per week is between 43 and 44. However, of that average, from 4 to 5 hours are spent by the miners in traveling from the mouth of the mines to their places of work, for which time they are now paid. So, as a whole, the average number of hours worked does not exceed 40 a week, and consequently the cause of their strike cannot be hours.

Then, Mr. President, is the issue one of safety? My good friend, the Senator from Colorado, raised that question. I am informed that for many years the coal operators have been making every effort possible to make more effective the safety methods with relation to the work of coal miners. Recently the coal operators suggested the appointment of a commission to be composed of an engineer chosen by the miners, another to be chosen by the operators, and a third to be chosen by the head of the Bureau of Mines. The commission was to be authorized to investigate all the laws of the various States in which coal is mined with the view of suggesting that the State laws be unified and made more effective so as to assure increased safety for the miners; so as to protect the lives and the health of miners. But, Mr. President, did Mr. Lewis accede to the suggestion? No. He wants to have created a large fund at the expense of the operators to take care of the miners in the event they are injured or in case some are killed or the health of others is impaired.

Mr. President, I shall now read from a statement which was made by Mr. O'Neill and which, in a measure, will answer my good friend from Colorado who raised the question of safety. What I am about to read is from a speech by Mr. Charles O'Neill, spokesman for the operators negotiating committee of the National Bituminous Coal Wage Conference. The speech was delivered on Wednesday, May 1, over the American Broadcasting System. This is what he said on the question of safety:

Mr. Lewis has been in the industry for a great many years and his sudden interest in safety is suspected by the operators. The so-

called investigation that he and his employees presented to the conference was found to be exaggerated 100 percent when the number of fatalities in the 14-year period used by him was really only one-half as large as stated, by figures of the Bureau of Mines. Lewis' proposal to substitute recommendations of the Federal inspectors service, lacking police powers, for the State laws is unsound. The exaggerations and distortions, isolated instances, and part truths used by Mr. Lewis to bolster his assertions about safety, are denied by such authorities as Dan Harrington, Chief of the Safety Division of the Bureau of Mines, who said in February 1946:

"The over-all picture in health and safety in coal mining—both anthracite and bituminous—in the United States in 1945 is one of outstanding accomplishment and of hope for the future, immediate and distant. The trends, with few exceptions, chiefly promise continued reduction of accident rates—fatal and nonfatal."

That quotation, which is taken from the statement of the Chief of the Safety Division of the Bureau of Mines and shows that, after all, the question of safety is not one of the problems confronting the negotiators. I have been informed that the coal operators are willing to do anything within reason to give further protection to the lives and health of the miners.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the issue is not one of wages, hours, or safety methods now in use. The paramount issue is that Mr. Lewis has said to the coal operators of this country, "I will not deal with you unless you agree to pay 10 cents per ton so that we may put the money into a fund in order to protect the health of the miners." That is what he wants. He is seeking to exercise a governmental function by suggesting the imposition of a tax on the coal operators. That is what is in that man's fiendish mind. I will ask the Senator from Colorado if he thinks that such power should be used by this agitator in order to accomplish his ends?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think the safety of the miners and welfare of the miners' families should be protected. I think the coal industry is rich enough to enable such protection to be afforded.

Mr. ELLENDER. No one questions that the health of the miners should be protected and that provisions should be made for their families. I may say to the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have answered the question which the Senator propounded. For a great many years we have imposed in the State of Colorado a tax per ton of coal mined which went into the State treasury and was used for the protection of miners and to increase safeguards.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no objection to that method of approach. Let the State, the county, or the municipality do the taxing and not Mr. Lewis or any other labor leader. That is the main bone of contention between the coal operators and Mr. Lewis. The issue is whether Mr. Lewis will be able to force the coal operators to pay tribute to his union by way of what amounts to a tax.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If the Senator will permit me to answer the

question he has called on me to answer, he is correct in saying that the State or the Federal Government should collect a tax, and at least, whether they collect a tax or not, they should look after the welfare of the miners and place reasonable safeguards around them. But when the Government does not do that, when no one else does it, when there is disaster after disaster, when men are killed and maimed and injured all over the country day after day—

Mr. ELLENDER. What about employment-compensation laws and social-security laws which are now in effect in all States of our Union?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Oh, the compensation law, \$14 a week!

Mr. ELLENDER. It may be that it should be increased; I would be willing to vote for an increase if it is within the function of Congress, which I doubt, and if a just case can be made. What I am objecting to, and I know the Senator from Colorado objects to it, is giving to Mr. Lewis the power to tax the coal operators, because that is all it is. If the coal operators permit Mr. Lewis to get by with this, there will be nothing to prevent Mr. Reuther, head of the CIO auto union, from levying a tax on the production of automobiles, or some other labor leader levying so much for the production of an electric fan, so much for the production of an ice box, and so much in the case of various other products of industry. That is what is going to happen. So far as I am concerned, I do not want that to occur. I want the power of taxation to remain where it is now lodged. It is bad enough as it is.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does the Senator want me to answer, or does he want to preach to me?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not want to preach to the Senator. He has as much common sense as I have, if not more.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator, but I do not agree with his last statement. However, what I am trying to say is that it is the duty of the Government in some way to place safeguards around miners so as to prevent disgraceful and tragic mine disasters occurring as they have been occurring. If Government does not do that, if Government does not arrange for safeguards, if Government does not provide compensation for the families of men who have suffered death, as many men have, then it is time that John L. Lewis or somebody else attempted to do something about it. That is the point I am trying to make.

Whenever the Senator from Louisiana is able to come forward and say that the Government, or the State, or some other authority, has placed safeguards about the miners, and that the mines of the country are operating on a safe basis, I shall be ready to agree with him that tribute is not warranted, but until such time I cannot blame John L. Lewis or the organization which he represents for fighting for the safety and for the lives of the miners and for the compensation of the families of the sufferers from accidents and death.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to say to my distinguished friend from Colorado that I approve of the ob-

jectives he is discussing, except that I do not want to put into the hands of Mr. Lewis or any other labor leader—

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall not quarrel with the Senator about methods.

Mr. ELLENDER. The power of taxation or the privilege of exacting tribute. If ever the coal operators give way to Mr. Lewis in the fight that he is now engaged in, the Senator will witness what will happen to other industries as time goes on. The power to tax and to exact tribute by the individual will mean destruction of our free enterprise system. There are no strings attached to the tribute now sought to be exacted. Ten cents per ton of coal will mean a fund of \$60,000,000 per year and the union may use the money for any purposes it sees fit.

Mr. President, as I stated a while ago, it is not a question of wages, it is not a question of hours, it is not a question of safety; it is a question of the power of taxation. That power is what this unscrupulous schemer Lewis wants.

Another issue is the power of the union to take in supervisory employees. As all of us know, safety devices must be placed in coal mines, the interest of operators must be protected, and this must be by agents of the owners of the mines, men who owe allegiance to the employers. What Mr. Lewis has been trying to do for the past 3 or 4 years has been to force the coal operators to make it possible for all supervisory employees in the mines to be members of his union.

Permit me to say that one of the amendments I propose to present to the Senate if and when the Case bill comes up will be an amendment which will prevent the supervisory employees from being forced to join a union. I will not now take up the time of the Senate to further discuss this phase of Mr. Lewis' demand. I am in hopes of fully discussing that issue at the proper time.

Mr. President, as authority for the statement that the operators have been willing to negotiate, and that Mr. Lewis has been adamant on the subject, I point to the efforts put forth by the coal operators, as evidenced in the speech to which I referred a while ago by Mr. O'Neill, who said:

To speed a settlement and to bring peace and harmony in the industry, the operators made a proposal to Mr. Lewis on March 25. The proposal provided, first, a shortening of the workday and the workweek; second, an adjustment of wages in accord with Government wage-price policy.

As all of us know, in recent months the wages for various workmen were increased anywhere from 2 to as much as 20 percent, which meant an increase in the hourly wage of scores of workers of about 18½ cents. The mine operators have offered to raise the wages of miners to that extent, that is, to 18½ cents, if permitted under the prevailing wage policy of the Government; so that, as I said a while ago, wages are not the issue.

Third, the safety proposal which I discussed a while ago was likewise considered. The operators were willing to furnish a distinguished engineer provided the miners furnished one, and provided

further that the Bureau of Mines of the Federal Government furnished one—the three men to serve on a commission to investigate all the laws throughout the United States in every State where coal is produced, and recommend the strengthening of State laws so as to afford better safety devices in order to protect the health as well as the lives of the miners. But seemingly no attention has been paid by Mr. Lewis to the suggestion of the operators who are willing to cooperate.

The fourth proposal was to establish a reasonable fund for hardship cases, the mine workers to bear one-half the cost and the operators to bear the other half.

There was a proposal wherein the operators agreed to pay half the expenses of taking care of the aged who were no longer able to mine coal. That proposal was also refused by power-mad, blood-thirsty Lewis.

The coal operators offered to collect from the mine workers, without cost, assignments they might make for hospitals, medical services, and so forth, and turn the money over to the union for such disposition as it cared to make of the funds. That was likewise rejected.

I am informed that every effort has been made by the coal operators to settle the strike, all to no avail. Mr. Lewis is insistent that there shall be no settlement unless the coal operators agree to pay to his union 10 cents a ton tribute. Mr. President, I am informed that this tribute would amount to about \$60,000,000, which is far in excess of the annual profits made by the entire industry during recent years.

Mr. President, I wish to take occasion to compliment the distinguished Representative from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], who has introduced in the House of Representatives House bill 6259, the objective of which is to prevent the collection by any union of any funds that smells of taxation, or excise taxes. I hope the House will act favorably on the bill at an early date, and that the Senate will follow suit.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill to which I have just referred be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill to amend the Criminal Code so as to make unlawful certain harmful and disruptive practices in commerce

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the penal laws of the United States," approved March 4, 1909, as amended, is amended by adding after section 245 a new section to read as follows:

"Sec. 245A. (a) It shall be unlawful for any employer to pay or deliver, or to agree to pay or deliver, any money or other thing of value to any representative of any of his employees who are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any representative or agent of any employees who are engaged in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce to demand, receive, or accept, or to agree to receive or accept, from the employer of such employees any money or other thing of value, for the use of such representative or in trust or otherwise.

"(c) The provisions of this section shall not be applicable with respect to any money or other thing of value payable by an employer to an employee or former employee as compensation for, or by reason of, his services as an employee of such employer, and shall not be applicable with respect to any amounts deducted from the compensation of any employee and paid to a labor organization by an employer in payment of dues or other similar fees payable by such employee to such labor organization.

"(d) Any person who willfully violates any of the provisions of this section shall upon conviction thereof be subject to a fine of not more than \$10,000 or to imprisonment for not more than 6 months, or both.

"(e) The district courts of the United States and the United States courts of the Territories and possessions shall have jurisdiction, for cause shown, and subject to the provisions of section 17 (relating to notice to opposite party) of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 28, sec. 381), to restrain violations of this section, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 6 and 20 of such act of October 15, 1914, as amended, and the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes,' approved March 23, 1932.

"(f) As used in this section—

"(1) 'commerce' means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States, or between the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States and any State or other Territory, or between any foreign country and any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or within the District of Columbia or any Territory, or between points in the same State but through any other State or any Territory or the District of Columbia or any foreign country.

"(2) 'goods' means goods, wares, products, commodities, merchandise, or articles or subjects of commerce of any character, or any part or ingredient thereof.

"(3) 'produced' means produced, manufactured, mined, handled, or in any other manner worked on in any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia; and for the purposes of this section an employee shall be deemed to have been engaged in the production of goods if such employee was employed in producing, manufacturing, mining, handling, transporting, or in any other manner working on such goods, or in any process or occupation necessary to the production thereof, in any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

"(4) 'representative' means any individual who or organization which is authorized or purports to be authorized to deal with an employer, on behalf of two or more of his employees, concerning grievances, labor disputes, wages, rates of pay, hours of employment, or conditions of work."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand that the Senate is about to recess, and I do not wish to further indulge on the patience of Senators. I have much more I could say. I will reserve my further views pending future developments. It is my hope that Congress will take action at once so as to prevent the imposition of a tribute in favor of any organization, as is now being sought by Mr. Lewis. Should coal operators accede to the payment of an excise tax supposedly for the purpose of safeguarding the health of miners, I can visualize a pernicious system which will be destructive of our cherished freedom. It is my belief that the payment of such

tribute to a few overlords of labor, particularly of the John L. Lewis type, would lead, I repeat, to the destruction of our form of government by giving to them a power greater than that of a Caesar and more dangerous than that of a Hitler.

PROPOSED LOAN TO GREAT BRITAIN

The Senate resumed consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 138) to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, under rule XXII of the Senate, I wish to file a motion to bring to a close debate on the pending joint resolution.

I desire to make a brief statement. Two Senators, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], have requested that their names be added to this motion, but I understand that under the precedents of the Senate, Senators must sign in person, so I cannot ask to add their names.

One Senator who signed the motion yesterday, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], asked me to delete his name, because he did not want the closure to apply to the point of order which it is reported the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] may raise to the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The rule requires that the Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate. The motion is as follows:

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the resolution (S. J. Res. 138) entitled "Joint resolution to implement further the purposes of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act by authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out an agreement with the United Kingdom, and for other purposes."

JOSEPH BALL, H. ALEXANDER SMITH, WARREN R. AUSTIN, ALEXANDER WILEY, THOS. C. HART, CHAN GURNEY, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, HOMER FERGUSON, WAYNE MORSE, CLAUDE PEPPER, GLEN TAYLOR, THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, J. W. FULBRIGHT, SHERIDAN DOWNEY, ROBERT F. WAGNER, JAS. M. MEAD, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, SCOTT W. LUCAS, CARL A. HATCH, FRANCIS J. MYERS, BRIEN McMAHON.

Rule XXII requires that—

The Presiding Officer shall at once state the motion to the Senate, and 1 hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand that under the rule the vote on the motion will be had at 1 o'clock on Tuesday next, Sunday not being counted as a calendar day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sunday is not a calendar day. The rule provides that:

One hour after the Senate meets on the following calendar day but one, he shall lay the motion before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. Assuming that the Senate meets on Monday, then the vote would occur on the motion at 1 o'clock on Tuesday, assuming that the Senate meets at 12 o'clock on Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands, that is a correct statement.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Does the Chair take the position that Sunday is not a calendar day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is so advised.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in view of the filing of the motion to close debate, which cannot be voted on until Tuesday, I see no particular purpose in prolonging the session today; and, there being no Executive Calendar, I therefore move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 16 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, May 6, 1946, at 12 o'clock meridian.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 6, 1946

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 5, 1946)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God—
"The busy tribes of flesh and blood,
With all their cares and fears,
Are carried downward with the flood
And lost in following years";

but Thy eternity outlasts all worlds; before Thee the nations are as the dust of the balance. Yet swiftly passing as is our brief stay here Thou deignest to use us with all our blots and blemishes as the channels for Thy surging purpose for a redeemed earth, freed from the blight of hate, fit for the habitation of all Thy children.

As servants of the people, may we be the agents of Thy will and Thy kingdom, that Thy will may be done and Thy kingdom come, as it is in heaven so on the earth. In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Saturday, May 4, 1946, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the